

This document has been published by authorization of the Director of the State of Michigan's Department of Transportation in keeping with the intent of the *National Environmental Policy Act of 1969* and subsequent implementing regulations and policies that direct agencies to provide the public and other agencies an opportunity to review and comment on proposed projects and alternatives so that potential impacts of the project can be considered and taken into account during the decision-making process. The cost of publishing 150 copies of this document at approximately \$ 14.50 per copy is \$2175, and the document has been printed in accordance with *Michigan Executive Directive 1991-6*.

## **Proposed Reconstruction of M-15 from I-75 to I-69 Oakland and Genesee Counties, Michigan**

### **DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT & DRAFT SECTION 4(f) EVALUATION**

Submitted Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 4332 (2)(c) and 49 U.S.C. 303

By The  
**U.S. Department of Transportation  
Federal Highway Administration  
and  
Michigan Department of Transportation**

1/22/02  
Date of Approval

  
FHWA Division Administrator

For additional information concerning the proposed project, or this document, contact:

Mr. James A. Kirschensteiner  
Assistant Division Administrator  
Federal Highway Administration  
315 West Allegan Street, Rm. 207  
Lansing, MI 48933  
Phone: (517) 702-1835

Mr. Ronald Kinney, Manager  
Environmental Section  
Michigan Department of Transportation  
P.O. Box 30050  
Lansing, MI 48909  
Phone: (517) 335-2621

This Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Section 4(f) Evaluation describe the social, economic, and natural environmental impacts associated with proposed improvements to 20 miles of M-15 between I-75 and I-69 in Oakland and Genesee Counties. This document includes a summary of the planning basis and of the impacts associated with the proposed project and the process involved in determining the preferred alternative. Mitigation measures are also included. A Section 4(f) Evaluation is included because of adverse effects on historic resources. The estimated cost of the proposed project is \$133,000,000. Thirty-eight residential displacements and 40 commercial displacements are anticipated. The estimate of direct wetlands effects is 13.4 acres.

Comments on this Draft Environmental Impact Statement are due 60 days after the date of the public hearing and should be sent to: Mr. Jose A Lopez, Michigan Department of Transportation, PO Box 30050, Lansing, Michigan 48909.

## PREFACE

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 requires that the social, economic, and natural environmental impacts of any proposed action of the federal government be analyzed for decision-making and public information purposes. There are three classes of action. Class I Actions are those that may significantly affect the environment and require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Class II Actions (categorical exclusions) are those that do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the environment and do not require the preparation of an EIS or an Environmental Assessment (EA). Class III Actions are those for which the significance of impacts is not clearly established. Class III Actions require the preparation of an EA to determine the significance of impacts and the appropriate environmental document to be prepared – either an EIS or a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

This document is a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed improvement of M-15 from I-75 in Oakland County to I-69 in Genesee County in Michigan. It describes and analyzes proposed alternatives, and the measures taken to minimize harm to the project area. It will be distributed to various federal, state, and local agencies for review and comment. A public hearing on this document will then be held. Public and agency comments will be summarized in a Final EIS and responses will be provided. Any necessary changes resulting from the comments will be made. Once these changes and additions have been made, the FEIS will be forwarded to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) with a recommendation that a Record of Decision (ROD) be issued. The ROD will act as Location/Design Approval, allowing the project to move forward to the design stage when funding is identified. After design come the right-of-way acquisition and construction phases. No funding has been identified past this environmental / planning phase.

Because of adverse effects on historic resources, this document also serves as coordination documentation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and as the draft Section 4(f) Evaluation, under Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, which also protects historic resources.

This document was prepared by a consultant working with the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), in cooperation with FHWA and other members of a Steering Committee. The Steering Committee includes representatives from the following divisions within MDOT: Design, Project Planning, Real Estate, Construction and Technology, Traffic and Safety, and the Metro and Bay Regions. Information was also furnished by other federal and state agencies, local units of government, public interest groups, an Advisory Committee of stakeholders and interested local groups, and individual citizens.

This Draft EIS may be reviewed at the MDOT's Lansing office at 425 West Ottawa Street (third floor), 48909; the Metro Region office at 18101 W. Nine Mile Road, Southfield, Michigan 48075; or, the Bay Region office at 55 E. Morley Drive, Saginaw, Michigan 48601. It is also available at the Brandon Township Public Library, 304 South Street, Ortonville, Michigan 48462; and, the offices of the Village of Goodrich at 10242 West Hegel Road, Goodrich, Michigan 48438. Technical documents referred to in this Environmental Impact Statement that support the decision-making process that led to the Preferred Alternative are available at the same locations. Summaries are also available. The Draft EIS and summaries are also available at MDOT's Transportation Service Centers at 2300 Dixie Highway, Waterford, Michigan 48238 and 9459 Lapeer Road, Davison, Michigan 48423.

# Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Preface .....	ii
 <b>SECTION 1 – SUMMARY</b>	
1.1 Description of the Proposed Project.....	1-1
1.2 Alternatives .....	1-3
1.2.1 No Action Alternative.....	1-3
1.2.2 Low Cost Improvements/Transportation Systems Management.....	1-4
1.2.3 New Alignments .....	1-4
1.2.4 M-15 Reconstruction .....	1-4
1.2.5 Alternatives Eliminated from Further Study .....	1-4
1.2.6 Preferred Alternative .....	1-4
1.3 Impacts .....	1-6
1.3.1 Traffic and Safety.....	1-6
1.3.2 Relocations, Community Cohesion, Environmental Justice, Land Use, and Farmland .....	1-6
1.3.3 Economics .....	1-8
1.3.4 Air Quality.....	1-8
1.3.5 Noise.....	1-8
1.3.6 Ecological Resources.....	1-8
1.3.7 Cultural Resources and Parkland .....	1-21
1.3.8 Visual Conditions .....	1-21
1.3.9 Hazardous Materials .....	1-21
1.3.10 Soils and Utilities .....	1-22
1.3.11 Secondary and Cumulative Impacts .....	1-22
1.3.12 Energy.....	1-22
1.3.13 Cost.....	1-23
1.4 Areas of Controversy.....	1-23
1.5 Permits .....	1-23
1.6 Unresolved Issues.....	1-24
1.7 Project Status .....	1-25
 <b>SECTION 2 – PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION</b>	
2.1 Purpose of the Proposed Action.....	2-1
2.1.1 Project Background .....	2-1
2.2 Need for the Proposed Action.....	2-1
2.2.1 Land Use and Growth.....	2-2
2.2.2 Current Road Conditions .....	2-2
2.2.3 Transportation System Linkages.....	2-2
2.2.4 Traffic and Level of Service.....	2-3
2.2.5 Crashes.....	2-3
2.2.6 Conclusion.....	2-5

### **SECTION 3 – ALTERNATIVES**

3.1	Alternatives Development.....	3-1
3.2	Alternatives Eliminated from Further Study .....	3-2
3.3	No Action Alternative.....	3-10
3.4	Preferred Alternative .....	3-11
3.4.1	Typical Sections .....	3-12
3.4.2	U-turn Channels and Loons .....	3-14
3.4.3	Interchange at I-75 .....	3-14

### **SECTION 4 – AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES**

4.1	Relocations .....	4-1
4.2	Social Impacts/Community Cohesion .....	4-2
4.2.1	Community Facilities .....	4-2
4.2.2	Considerations Relating to Pedestrian Access and Bicycle Use.....	4-8
4.2.3	Considerations Relating to Mass Transit Service .....	4-9
4.2.4	Maintaining Traffic .....	4-9
4.2.5	Population Trends .....	4-10
4.2.6	Other Population Characteristics .....	4-10
4.3	Environmental Justice.....	4-14
4.4	Economic Impacts and Tax Base Loss.....	4-15
4.4.1	Economic Background.....	4-15
4.4.2	Tax Base Loss.....	4-16
4.5	Land Use and Zoning .....	4-17
4.6	Farmland/Michigan Act 233 Lands/Forest Land.....	4-17
4.7	Air Quality Analysis .....	4-17
4.8	Noise Analysis .....	4-20
4.9	Threatened and Endangered Species.....	4-21
4.10	Waterways/Water Quality/Floodplains .....	4-22
4.10.1	Waterways.....	4-22
4.10.2	Water Quality .....	4-23
4.10.3	Floodways and Floodplains .....	4-23
4.11	Wetlands.....	4-25
4.12	Historic and Archaeological Resources .....	4-31
4.12.1	Historic Architecture .....	4-32
4.12.2	Archaeological Resources.....	4-35
4.13	Parkland .....	4-35
4.14	Visual Conditions .....	4-35
4.15	Contaminated Sites.....	4-35
4.16	Soils and Utilities .....	4-40
4.17	Construction Permits .....	4-40
4.18	Secondary and Cumulative Impacts .....	4-40
4.19	Energy .....	4-41
4.20	Cost .....	4-41
4.21	The Relationship Between Local Short-Term Uses of the Environment and the Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity .....	4-41
4.22	Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources Which Would be Involved in the Proposed Action .....	4-41

## **SECTION 5 – MITIGATION OF IMPACTS**

5.1	Right-of-Way Acquisition .....	5-1
5.2	Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control.....	5-2
5.3	Environmental Permits .....	5-3
5.4	Existing Vegetation .....	5-4
5.5	Disposal of Surplus or Unsuitable Material .....	5-4
5.6	Groundwater Quality .....	5-5
5.7	Surface Water Quality .....	5-5
5.8	Maintaining Traffic During Construction .....	5-6
5.9	Continuance of Public Utility Service .....	5-6
5.10	Construction Noise Levels and Vibration Impacts.....	5-6
5.11	Control of Air Pollution During Construction .....	5-6
5.12	Wetland Mitigation.....	5-7
5.13	Additional Mitigation or Modifications .....	5-11

## **SECTION 6 – DRAFT SECTION 4(f) EVALUATION**

6.1	Introduction .....	6-1
6.2	Proposed Action and Need for Project .....	6-1
6.3	Description of Historic Resources.....	6-1
6.3.1	Ernest and Harriet Dawley Residence, 850 Ortonville Road (M-15), Ortonville .....	6-2
6.3.2	Michigan Milk Producers Receiving Station, 126 N. Ortonville Road, Ortonville .....	6-2
6.3.3	Henry Hawes Residence, 8083 State Road (M-15), Goodrich.....	6-4
6.3.4	Frederick Sweers Farm/Louhelen Baha'i School, 8201 State Road.....	6-4
6.4	Impacts on the Section 4(f) Properties .....	6-5
6.5	Avoidance Alternatives.....	6-7
6.6	Measures to Minimize Harm.....	6-8
6.7	Coordination .....	6-9

## **SECTION 7 – EARLY COORDINATION AND PUBLIC MEETINGS**

7.1	Early Coordination .....	7-1
7.1.1	Federal Agencies.....	7-1
7.1.2	State Agencies .....	7-1
7.2	Public Meetings .....	7-2

## **SECTION 8 – LIST OF PREPARERS .....**

## **SECTION 9 – DISTRIBUTION LIST.....**

## APPENDICES

Appendix A	Traffic Analysis Report Summary .....	A-1
Appendix B	Engineering Report Summary .....	B-1
Appendix C	Scoping Meetings and Correspondence.....	C-1
Appendix D	Relocation Plan - Conceptual Stage .....	D-1
Appendix E	Air Quality Analysis Report Summary.....	E-1
Appendix F	Noise Analysis Report Summary .....	F-1
Appendix G	Threatened and Endangered Species Report Summary .....	G-1
Appendix H	Wetlands Report Summary .....	H-1
Appendix I	Phase I Above-ground Survey Resources Survey Summary.....	I-1
Appendix J	Phase I Archaeological Survey Summary.....	J-1
Appendix K	Contamination Survey Summary .....	K-1
Appendix L	Draft Memorandum of Agreement with SHPO .....	L-1
Appendix M	Letter and Resolution from Village of Goodrich .....	M-1

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1	Daily Traffic Volumes 1998 and 2025 .....	1-2
Figure 1-2	Preferred Alternative .....	1-5
Figure 1-3a	Site Map.....	1-9
Figure 1-3b	Site Map.....	1-10
Figure 1-3c	Site Map.....	1-11
Figure 1-3d	Site Map.....	1-12
Figure 3-1	Alternative No. 1.....	3-3
Figure 3-2	Alternative No. 2.....	3-5
Figure 3-3	One-Way Pair Concept - Goodrich .....	3-6
Figure 3-4	Evaluation Sectors.....	3-7
Figure 3-5	Road Types.....	3-13
Figure 4-1	Community Facilities .....	4-3
Figure 4-2a	1990 Census Tracts .....	4-11
Figure 4-2b	2000 Census Tracts .....	4-12
Figure 4-3	Land Use.....	4-18
Figure 4-4	Zoning.....	4-19
Figure 4-5	Floodplains .....	4-24
Figure 5-1	Potential Mitigation Sites.....	5-8
Figure 5-2	Oakwood Road Site .....	5-9
Figure 5-3	GM REALM Site .....	5-10
Figure 5-4	Thayer Road Site.....	5-11
Figure 6-1	Dawley Residence, Michigan Milk Producers, Hawes Residence, Louhelen Farmhouse .....	6-3
Figure 6-2	Ortonville West District.....	6-5



## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1	Corridor Population Growth .....	1-1
Table 1-2	Summary of Impacts.....	1-7
Table 1-3a	Wetland Sites Shown on Figure 1-3 .....	1-13
Table 1-3b	Potential <i>National Register</i> Historical and Archaeological Sites Shown on Figure 1-3 .....	1-18
Table 1-3c	Potential Contamination Sites Shown on Figure 1-3.....	1-19
Table 1-3d	Potential Threatened or Endangered Species Sites Shown on Figure 1-3 .....	1-21
Table 2-1	Signalization and Level of Service.....	2-4
Table 3-1	Additional 2025 Traffic Projections .....	3-4
Table 3-2	First-Level Screening Evaluation Factors Percentage Weighting and Ranking.	3-6
Table 3-3	Evaluation Data – Practical Alternatives to Widening M-15 .....	3-8
Table 3-4	Practical Alternative Scoring Results .....	3-10
Table 4-1	Relocation Information .....	4-1
Table 4-2	Corridor Population Growth .....	4-10
Table 4-3	Key Population Characteristics .....	4-13
Table 4-4	Minority and Low-Income Populations in Corridor Census Tracts.....	4-14
Table 4-5	Change in State Equalized Value - Corridor Townships .....	4-15
Table 4-6	Tax Base Loss.....	4-16
Table 4-7	Summary of Wetland Characteristics .....	4-26
Table 4-8	Summary of Estimated Impacts and Potential Compensatory Mitigation Requirements .....	4-31
Table 4-9	Potential <i>National Register</i> Eligible Cultural Resources.....	4-33
Table 4-10	Contamination Summary .....	4-37
Table 4-11	Preliminary Cost Estimate.....	4-42
Table 5-1	Summary of Potential Compensatory Mitigation .....	5-8
Table 6-1	Potential <i>National Register</i> Eligible Cultural Resources – Adverse Effects.....	6-8